UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,) Criminal Action) No. 1:19-CR-337 Plaintiff,) February 28, 2020 v.) 10:04 a.m. ANDREW JON THOMASBERG, Defendant.

> TRANSCRIPT OF SENTENCING PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE HONORABLE LIAM O'GRADY, UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

Anthony Mariano, Assistant U.S. For the United States: Attorney

> US Attorney's Office (Alexandria-NA) 2100 Jamieson Avenue Alexandria, VA 22314 703-299-3700

Email: Anthony.Mariano2@usdoj.gov

Ronald L. Walutes, Jr., Assistant U.S. Attorney

United States Attorney's Office 2100 Jamieson Ave Alexandria, VA 22314 (703)299-3700

Email: Ron.walutes@usdoj.gov

For the Defendant: Gretchen Lynch Taylor, Esq.

> Taylor Law Company 10605 Judicial Drive

Suite A-5

Fairfax, VA 22030 (703) 385-5529 Fax: (703) 934-1004

Email: Gretchen@taylorlawco.com

APPEARANCES: Cont. Court Reporter: Scott L. Wallace, RDR, RMR, CRR Official Court Reporter United States District Court 401 Courthouse Square Alexandria, VA 2231-5798 703.549.4626 Scottwallace.edva@gmail.com Proceedings reported by machine shorthand, transcript produced by computer-aided transcription.

MORNING SESSION, FEBRUARY 28, 2020 1 2 (10:04 a.m.) .3 THE DEPUTY CLERK: The Court calls case 1:19-CR-337, United States of America versus Andrew Jon Thomasberg for 4 5 sentencing. May I have the appearances, please, first for the 6 government. 7 MR. MARIANO: Good morning, Your Honor. Anthony Mariano and Ronald Walutes for the United States. 8 9 THE COURT: All right. Good morning to you both. MS. TAYLOR: Good morning, Your Honor, Gretchen Taylor on 10 11 behalf of the defendant. 12 THE COURT: All right. Good morning, Ms. Taylor. MS. TAYLOR: I just have to have my client sign something 13 14 real quick, Your Honor. 15 THE COURT: Certainly. Take whatever time you need. 16 (Brief pause in proceedings.) THE COURT: All right. This comes on for sentencing. Are 17 18 you ready to proceed? 19 MR. MARIANO: Yes, Your Honor. 20 MS. TAYLOR: Yes, Your Honor. 21 THE COURT: All right. Does the government have any 22 objections to the Guideline calculations or the contents of the 23 presentence report? 24 MR. MARIANO: We do not, Your Honor. 25 THE COURT: All right. Ms. Taylor, do you have an

objection to the --

MS. TAYLOR: We do have an objection to the Guidelines,
Your Honor. As far as our other objections that don't affect the
Guidelines, we don't need to discuss those today. I don't think
any of them are essential to the disposition of the case today,
but we are still asking the Court to consider granting a
reduction in the Guidelines due to my client possessing all
ammunition and firearms solely for lawful sporting purposes or
collection, which is -- it's a big difference in the Guidelines,
and I can proceed however the Court wants. I can either proffer
my client's testimony or I can call him to the stand.

THE COURT: You can go ahead and proffer it. That's fine.

MS. TAYLOR: Yes, Your Honor. My client would testify, if called, that he did, in fact, possess all of his firearms and ammunition for lawful sporting purposes or collections. He has had a keen interest in firearms since, I would say, probably the age of nine or ten. He's always been around them. He had been taken to the range with his dad and his granddad for many, many years. That is why he basically had them. And then he started developing an interest in the history of the firearms and started collecting them once he was able to legally purchase them himself, and then he had some that were, you know, purchased by family members, but he had six firearms in his bedroom, and he had one firearm which actually belonged to his father which was recovered from his car. It was secured in a glove box which does

not make it a violation of Virginia law for carrying a concealed weapon. He would testify that he had never -- he has never brandished, discharged, or carried unlawfully any of those firearms.

The government will say that some of my client's friends have said that he will carry them about his person. He would testify only on private property with permission, and he did not feel that that was a violation of Virginia law. It was just in transport to a range or to something of that nature, but that he was keeping these firearms because of his interest in firearms.

He's worked as a gunsmith, and he was not keeping them to prepare for a racial holy war, as the government has suggested. They have given you 60-some pages of text messages. These are private chat messages between him and his friends. These are not propaganda put on the Internet. And although the government claims that he suggested that he was amassing this -- these weapons for a racial holy war. Actually, he never said that. He believed that there was, when he wrote these almost two years ago, that there was some racial holy war coming in the future. That's what he's telling his friends, but he doesn't say anything in there directly about amassing an arsenal for such. He wasn't. He has guns because he's always had guns, and that's what they're for.

I also made the point in my brief that his very similar codefendant who's also on all these same text messages, was given

the reduction pursuant to an agreement by the government. He actually had in his possession, according to the Statement of Facts, four firearms, and one of them is the same firearm that was the subject of the straw purchase that my client pled guilty to. So, he is part of that same transaction, and the actual gun was in Brian Baynes' possession, who was given the enhanced — was given the reduction. Brian Baynes also had a ton of ammunition in his possession. I think I counted it up and it was over 1300 rounds, lots of ammunition and magazines. There's just no real difference between the two, and Brian Baynes was given the reduction, and I think that's a factor that the Court could also consider.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Ms. Taylor. Who owned the gun locker in the basement?

MS. TAYLOR: Oh, that's his grandfather's, who's now deceased, Your Honor, and his grandmother is here, and she would testify that he was a military war veteran. He had a collection of mostly old rifles, and they were locked up in the basement. Those were all his grandfather's rifles.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Mariano.

MR. MARIANO: Thank you, Your Honor. The defense didn't talk about one criminal -- one very important point, and that's the defendant's criminal history. And I know the defense wants to focus on the four firearms that are in the Statement of Facts, but the Guidelines suggest otherwise. The Guidelines direct the

.3

Court, among other factors, to consider whether the defendant has a criminal history that involves firearms, and, in fact, he does.

And that's one of the -- among a number of factors that distinguishes this case from that of Brian Baynes.

Additionally, Your Honor, this is a defendant who strawpurchased a firearm that wasn't for a collection purpose; it was
a purchase that he made to give to another individual that he
knew was a controlled substance user. I have to reject the
characterization of the text messages. They were private text
messages, but what they show is his purpose. And when the
defendant who has amassed so many weapons is saying things like,
"Get your gear ready because RAHOWA is coming," I think it's very
obvious what he means by that when he's collecting all these
firearms, when he's keeping them next to his bed, in his desk
drawer, in his car, a loaded gun in his car? I don't think
individuals are keeping a loaded gun in their car for purposes of
collection. So I think all of those factors counsel very
strongly against the reduction.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

MS. TAYLOR: If I could just respond very briefly to the criminal history argument, Your Honor. It was an assault conviction, not a gun conviction, when my client was 14 years old. And as the Court, I'm sure, is aware, because it was in the presentence report, the circumstances surrounding that is that prior to him discharging a firearm there was — he was dragged by

a car. He was run over by the car, in fact, and had hashmarks on his arm he showed to the police because he had been dragged. One part says 65 feet, another part says a hundred feet, whatever, a long way, and in kind of reaction to stop the car, he shot at the car. He didn't hit the car, he didn't hit any people, and he was not convicted of a gun offense. And, again, this was when he was 14 in Juvenile Court. Thank you, Your Honor.

reduction, very prominently is the word "solely for lawful supporting purposes or collection," and when you go to note 6, it points the Court to the number and type of firearms, the amount and type of ammunition, the location and the circumstances of the weapons, the prior convictions for firearm-related offenses; all those facts weigh against giving the reduction, the firearms next to the bed, the one in the car is significant, magazines strewn throughout the car, the 47 other magazines strewn around his bedroom and home, the prior conviction -- and I understand the circumstances of that, but they certainly are evidence that these weapons are not for collection or sporting purposes but for defense, if necessary, and for protection.

In any event, they're not for collection and sporting purposes, and I agree with Mr. Mariano that the text messages are evidence that the purpose of these guns went far beyond sporting purposes or collection and instead also were being collected for any war that would take place, even -- and I understand that

2

.3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
there's a belief that Mr. Thomasberg was puffing or he was just
going along with the theme of the chats when he made several of
these unfortunate statements, but they certainly are evidence
that the guns were there for more than the purpose -- and when
you're looking at the restriction of the word -- using the word
"solely," I don't find that the 2K2.1(b)(2) reduction is proper.
So, your exception is noted, but I'm not going to give that.
      Mr. Thomasberg, did you read the presentence report, sir?
      THE DEFENDANT: I have, Your Honor.
      THE COURT: And any other corrections, additions, that you
want made to the report at this time?
      THE DEFENDANT: No, Your Honor.
      THE COURT: All right. Have a seat. Thank you.
      I'll order the report filed without amendment. The
Guideline range is properly calculated at a level 13 after
Mr. Thomasberg has received 3 points for acceptance of
responsibility and results in a Guideline range of 12 to 18
months and one to three years of supervised release. And I read
the parties' submissions.
      Mr. Mariano, I'll hear anything else that you want to say
at this time.
      MR. MARIANO: Yes, Your Honor. We've recommended a term
of imprisonment of 18 months, and we think that's appropriate for
a number of reasons, and first I'll address the seriousness of
these offenses. Any ordinary 922(q)(3) offense is very serious
```

.3

because, as the Fourth Circuit has recognized, the combination of drugs and firearms can be dangerous, and even deadly, but here the defendant's conduct was even worse.

This is an individual who has a long history of drugrelated problems and was combining multiple drugs with multiple
firearms, and he wasn't just possessing those firearms; he was
buying and selling firearms. He has admitted to regularly
carrying firearms in his post-arrest interview, so we think that
makes it even more serious than the typical case, and it's the
same situation with the 922(a)(6). That is always a serious
offense because it conceals critical information from law
enforcement, and it makes it harder for them to prevent violent
crime and harder to investigate violent crime when it occurs.
But here the defendant's conduct was even more aggravating
because he provided the firearm that he straw purchased to an
individual that he knew was prohibited because that person was a
controlled substance user.

In fact, the defendant had provided controlled substances to the person that he provided the gun to. And while the counts are grouped for Guidelines purposes, I think the Court should seriously consider that there are multiple separate offenses here, and that shows a repeated disregard for an unwillingness to follow the law, and that's particularly troubling because the defendant did work at a gun store, so he would know more than most defendants what the laws and the regulations were, and he

chose to disregard them.

Finally, I would ask the Court to look at the statements that the defendant provided in their position paper, because I think what he does is he admits his guilt; but I think troublingly he doesn't really acknowledge the wrongfulness of his conduct, and I think that's important to consider because it speaks to a risk of recidivism.

Additionally, Your Honor, I want to mention the defendant's history and characteristics, because I think that's one of the factors that makes this conduct so troubling and alarming. And I know that when we talk about the defendant's words the defense says that we don't punish people in this country for having hate in their hearts, and that's right, and we're not asking the Court to do this because it's not just the associations and it's not that the words reflect hate, it's that the words promote and glorify racially motivated violence, and everyone in the community understands how dangerous that can be.

So, we are asking the Court to consider those words. What he says is, "Could have been so good; at least he did something."

That was after a synagogue shooting in California in April 2014 when one person was murdered.

"I wish he seized shit up." Those were the words of the defendant after an October 2018 mass shooting in which 11 people were murdered.

Saint Roof, Saint Terrence, Saint Bowers, these are the

.3

honorifics bestowed by the defendant on mass murderers. These are the people, apparently, that he looked up to. And these weren't, as the defense has tried to suggest, just words.

On February 10th, 2013 the defendant went beyond words when he went to an attempted drug deal, brought a firearm with him, and when the individuals took the drugs that he was selling and left without paying, the defense was right, he was knocked to the ground, he had been dragged, but then as the car was speeding away he stood up, reached into his pocket, pulled out a firearm, held it with both hands, aimed and fired a shot at the vehicle, those driving away from him when he was in no real danger.

So, this isn't just the defendant that talks about and glorifies violence; this is a defendant who has shown a willingness to engage in acts of violence himself.

So, as I've been thinking about this sentencing, I think about the adage, "When someone shows you who they are, believe them the first time." And this defendant has shown the Court through his criminal conduct and his criminal history who he is, and this defendant has told the Court in his own words who he is. All we're asking is that the Court believe him. Believe him when he shows a willingness to engage in an act of violence with a firearm; believe him when he says, quote, "I'll go Saint Roof in an instant," talking about mass murderer or Dylann Roof, because the sentence the Court imposes has to protect the public, and I would submit that the risk is too high for the Court not to take

the defendant at his word and at his actions.

So we've recommended 18 months, but I would just add that the Court, of course, has the discretion to go above the Guidelines, and that might be appropriate, whereas here I would submit that the criminal history understates the defendant's record, particularly as it relates to the instant offense because they were both involving firearms and drugs.

Finally, we've also recommended the maximum term of supervised release, three years. We think that's appropriate to make sure that the defendant doesn't possess controlled substances or firearms again. And I would specifically request, as a special condition, that not only he not possess firearms or ammunition, but that he also not possess any magazines or any gun parts or components. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. All right, Ms. Taylor.

MS. TAYLOR: First, Your Honor, I would like to point out the defendant's family that's here in court supporting him. He's got a large and very supportive family. His mother is here, his father's here, his stepfather is here, both of his grandmothers are here, two sisters are here, a brother-in-law, two uncles, two aunts, and his therapist, Dr. Greelis, in the first row.

THE COURT: Good morning to all of you. Thank you for the letters that you wrote in support of Mr. Thomasberg. Thank you.

MS. TAYLOR: Obviously, very extensive letters submitted by the family, as well as the letters from Dr. Greelis, to try to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

give the Court a fuller picture of Andrew Thomasberg. Why is Andrew Thomasberg here? He was chosen to be prosecuted by the government due to his ideology and belief. That's the long and short of it. They identify people that they feel might be problems, and they check them out, and they figure out that he's got guns that maybe he shouldn't have. THE COURT: So --MS. TAYLOR: Yeah, go ahead. THE COURT: So you've got all of these people that have supported Mr. Thomasberg for so many years and think very highly of him and give a completely different side. Nobody has any idea that he's involved with this group and advocating a RAHOWA war. It's just completely off the radar. What do I do with that? MS. TAYLOR: Well, as I mentioned earlier, Your Honor, these are private chat messages with his friends. He's not going around promoting racial violence. He's not. So why -- it's not like he's sitting at the dinner table saying, Hey, mom, I think

THE COURT: Well, what about going down to a mall and screaming the N-word when he sees black individuals and going, Yeah, I screamed at the top of my lungs and nobody did anything, and so I'm empowered that way? That's public.

I'll go shoot up a synagogue today, because that's not what he

believes. So, if he's talking --

MS. TAYLOR: That's what he says happened. There's actually no proof that that happened, Your Honor. This is my

2

.3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

point. He is exhibiting grandiosity among his friends that he thinks will follow those similar beliefs and thinks that's cool. You have to take into account his age. That's a huge issue here. I mean, 14 when he had the prior incident, and when he's writing most of these text messages I think he's around 19. Now he's about to turn 22. His brain obviously is not fully formed yet. There's no doubt. And he does have symptoms of autism. He said it to the probation officer preparing the report, and I think it's consistent with what his family would say, that he has never felt that he's fit in. He just doesn't. He's a little bit awkward in social situations, but it's more than just a little bit awkward, so he seeks out people who were like him. I think it makes him more susceptible to these kinds of recruiting by these extremist groups, but I don't think he was shouting it from any mountaintop at all. I don't think that's what was happening here. I think he had these beliefs about this, you know, coming holy war that he doesn't even espouse now, right; that, you know, it's part of growing up. You try on new hats and see if they fit. They don't fit. He's never been raised to believe that, he doesn't believe that, but he has made it seem like he does in his chats with his friends. But you notice the government's not claiming that he actually did anything illegal in the rally in Charlottesville or, you know, actually in public espoused violence. THE COURT: But he's about -- you know, when he gets

.3

arrested he's about to enroll with a new group, the Patriot Front, but now standing here today he says I'm not involved, I don't intend to be involved in any of those groups ever again.

THE COURT: And so what do I -- what's the -- what happened?

MS. TAYLOR: Correct.

MS. TAYLOR: Well, number one, he's been sitting in jail for over five months. That happened. This has been a huge thing for him. I think the only other time is when he was in JDC for a couple of days, juvenile, you know. This has been a turning point in his life. He now realizes he can never be in possession of a gun. That's a big deal for him, and he's voluntarily taken that step. The government didn't have to put him through a trial. He came in here and pled guilty and said, Yes, I know the result of this means I will never possess a firearm again, and he's okay with that.

So he's reshaped his whole worldview. I think he's actually kind of enjoyed getting to know all the different people in the jail. They come from all walks of life. He's lived a pretty sheltered life. You know, he grew up primarily in McLean in Loudoun County, and he has not had, maybe, exposure to as many people as the typical -- as the typical person his age has. So, you know, he has had more exposure now, and that has been a good thing for him, but the Patriot Front, I think, is more of a reaction to breaking up with his girlfriend and whatever. I

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

don't think they espoused violence, per se. He never actually did anything with them, but I think there has been a huge shift since he was arrested, and I think even Mr. Baynes, I believe, didn't actually renounce his association after his arrest.

That's my understanding. I think, you know, they've all had come-to-Jesus moments with this whole thing and realized it's not okay. It's not okay.

But, essentially, what the Court has been asked to sentence my client on today is filling out a false statement on a firearm application and also being in possession of guns during the time he was also using substances. And he was not a daily user by any means, but he has experimented with lots of drugs over the course of his lifetime. I'm not saying he doesn't have a substance abuse problem, he clearly does, but it's not like he was, you know, a heroin addict that had to get his fix every day. It wasn't like that at all. He was looking for solutions to his chronic Lyme disease and the pain associated with that. It's been a real struggle for him, and it's been a huge issue in the They can't manage it here. He has suffered a lot, and I think that causes you to appreciate your freedom more than others. When he says it's been harder for me than the average Joe, what he means by that is because of his medical issues he feels like this incarceration has been harder on him, and he's anxious to return back to his lime protocols so he's not in constant pain as he has been.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I would ask the Court to take into account that the reason why his case and Brian's case, Brian Baynes' case are in different positions is because the government controls the narrative. They control the process, obviously. They chose to arrest Brian first so he could get information on Andrew. they did it in reverse, Andrew would have given information about Neither one of them is a liar. They both told the truth. Brian was every much as involved in that transaction as Andrew was. So, because he has one charge versus two, that's totally the government's doing. They could charge Andrew with seven charges for seven guns. I mean, you know, they control that. That doesn't make their case different or the facts of their case different. They both espoused the exact same ideology. They both had the same types of guns. They both had a lot of ammunition, all those kinds of things, and they both had a criminal history one.

I do not think it is a huge, significant difference of one event that happened when my client was age 14, a freshman in high school. I don't. And even if -- obviously, the Court can take into account that in determining what a fair sentence is, obviously, but a sentence of time served, I do believe, avoids unwarranted sentencing disparity with Mr. Baynes. If you take into account -- for example, let's say -- let's say, hypothetically, the average defendant gets a 50 percent time cut when they cooperate. Well, he ends up with a 30-day intermittent

sentence. Would the Court have given him 60 days but for that?

So the government now wants to go for let's use that as a comparison, then. How does that compare to 18 months recommendation for my client? I mean, it's well, well different, and the difference is based on what? Brian's in all these same conversations. Brian has guns, too. Like, there's really no significant difference that would justify that much difference in sentence. The five and a half months he served is more than enough. It is very close to what a Guideline sentence would be if you take into account a Zone C disposition, meaning six months incarceration and six months alternative to incarceration like home detention.

If you do this, he's very close to that six months already, and I would ask the Court, would another three weeks make a difference? If he changes to a BOP inmate today, what are they going to do with him for three weeks, have him on a bus somewhere going from here to there? It's not going to serve any purpose. I would assert that any purpose that's going to be served by incarceration has already worked its magic on this young man. He has never done this before, and it has made a significant difference to him. And even if the Court gives him a split sentence and only gives him six months incarceration, it's essentially the same as what it is now. He could be on home detention and be very closely monitored by the probation department, and that still would be a Guideline sentence, but I

don't think the Guidelines are the be-all to end-all in this case. I don't think that the Court has to follow the Guidelines.

Obviously they're a recommendation. I think it's more important to avoid unwarranted sentencing disparities.

Andrew, as I talked about, you know, he is very smart. He gets exactly what's happening, and I believe that he will change his ways. He is very excited to start his future.

He needs, obviously, some more educational training. He was signed up, paid for, to attend EMT training. I think it was the week after he was arrested the classes were to begin. He would still like to do that. He does need some further counseling and psychiatric treatment.

I think that there have been several major issues in his family and background, both with dealing with his kind of upbringing and the turmoil in his family, but also the PTSD and acute stress disorder from the suicides of his friends when he was 18, and, you know, how all this interplays with Asperger's autism, as well as his unique circumstances. I think he needs continuing counseling and a psychiatric evaluation. He obviously needs continuing medical treatment, and all these things are best accomplished outside of the Bureau of Prisons' system. I can confirm that the jail has not been able to manage the chronic lime. Obviously, it doesn't help with -- jail is not helping him get any kind of psychological treatment.

And even if the Court followed the government's

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Guidelines, none of those things are going to be accomplished in that short of time in the Bureau of Prisons, and they can't be done well anyway. And if we are trying to make sure that Andrew lives a straight path from now on, the best way to do it is to make sure he's managed medically and psychologically, and the jail is only exacerbating that, not assisting in that endeavor at all.

So I would ask the Court to consider all those factors but primarily consider the sentencing disparity between his case and Brian Baynes' case. I pointed out another case in D.C. these guys know each other. That's why I said that I'm sure that Mr. Clark had something to say about Mr. Thomasberg and vice versa, and the government in that case was asking for a timeserved disposition, and he just happened to be locked up longer. It's a slower process than we have here in the Eastern District of Virginia, but regardless, I did put that quote in from the judge because I thought it was perfect. I felt this whole case that the government has really been pressing this case because of my client's extremist idealogies that have been expressed in the past in text messages, and the judge in the D.C. case we do not -- said we do not punish people for the hate they have in their hearts, and I think we all believe that, but practice and actions speak louder than words. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. All right,
Mr. Thomasberg, come to the podium, sir. This is your

.3

opportunity to tell me anything that you would like to before I sentence you, and please remain there when you're done.

THE DEFENDANT: I would just like to say to the Court that I apologize for all of my actions that have led up to this moment. This has been a very humbling experience, and my life will not resume the same walk.

THE COURT: You're a really potentially frightening person to our community. I mean, it's really -- praising mass murderers and screaming racial slurs in public, you know, that -- people with depraved minds do that, people that are so far off the community norms and people who just don't understand that we're an inclusive population and not an exclusive one.

What have you been doing to try and think about where you were at the time of your arrest versus where you are today? You know, I read with interest the fact that you're over at the detention center and you're sitting around folks who are MS-13 people or Crips and Bloods, and they're all fine with you and you're all fine with them, but, I mean, have you gone deeper? Have you really thought about how far out there you had gotten and how dangerous that is?

THE DEFENDANT: I have, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And what have you decided? What -- where are you going to be going forward?

THE DEFENDANT: As the prosecution has made it known, I have not formally renounced my former ideology, but I certify

here today that I do.

1

2

.3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: All right. No more chat rooms with extremists?

THE DEFENDANT: Correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: You know, you've had counseling over the years of your youth for a number of different reasons, and I'm very thankful that you got counseling for those events in your life, which have been significant, but now you need to face the fact that you need mental health counseling moving forward for the reasons -- whether it's the PTSD or the other stressors, but you need to make sure that you follow the regimen of the mental health experts who are going to be working with you in the future, and that you really appreciate how fortunate you are to be in the community -- and you'll be there shortly -- and how fortunate you are to have the support and love of your family, notwithstanding what you've been disclosed as having said, letters from, you know, African-Americans who are close family members who have said that they're shocked by this conduct, and that they support you and they know that in your heart you're not a racist. Those people need to be your support moving forward.

It doesn't really matter whether I give you 12 months or 10 months or 18 months, you'll be out soon and you'll be on probation for three years, and that probation officer is also going to be there to help you and provide the support you need moving forward, and I hope very much that you'll take advantage

of that.

I will tell you, without question, that I'll be here, if you don't uphold the conditions of your supervised release. If you come back before me and there's more history of this kind of action, then you can count on just going back to the penitentiary, and that's a promise. So, you've got the carrot and you've got the stick. The carrot is going out on probation and doing what you need to do to make sure that you become a contributing member of our community. I'm behind the scenes, and I guarantee you, if you screw up, you're not going to like what happens to you. Do we understand each other?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

both Ms. Taylor and Mr. Mariano made excellent points, as I knew they would as the advocates that they are, and I'm -- I must consider the sentence that Mr. Baynes received but also the offenses that you've been convicted of. You know, purchasing firearms while you are using drugs, as well as the arrangement you had with Baynes, that was unlawful in acquiring that other firearm, and also the -- even though you were 14, the fact that you discharged that weapon when you weren't in a position of using it for self-defense, those are -- they change the equation under the 3553 factors of the appropriate sentence for you, and so I'm going to sentence you to 12 months of incarceration, three years of supervised release on each of the two counts to run

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
concurrently, $200 special assessment. I'll not impose fines or
costs because I find you're unable to afford them. The special
conditions of supervised release are that you submit to mandatory
drug testing and treatment under the direction of the probation
officer; mental health counseling and treatment under the
direction of the probation officer; that you not possess a
computer or have access to online services without the approval
of the probation office; that you not possess, view, or access,
or otherwise use material that reflects extremist or terrorist
views or is deemed to be inappropriate by the probation/pretrial
services officer; that you not possess any weapons -- as you
know, it's unlawful for you to possess weapons in the future --
and also not possess the other parts of weapons, including the
components or magazines and ammunition.
      I'll give you credit for time served awaiting sentencing.
I'm not sure that the sentence is long enough where he would be
designated.
      MS. TAYLOR: He will be designated somewhere, Your Honor.
      THE COURT: You think he will?
      MS. TAYLOR: I would ask you to add one day to that
sentence to make it 12 months and one day, if the Court would,
please.
      THE COURT: I'll do that, which will make you eligible for
parole a little sooner. Do you have a designation, then?
      MS. TAYLOR: Just as close as possible to Northern
```

```
1
     Virginia, perhaps Morgantown.
 2
            THE COURT: All right. I don't think there's any mental
 3
     health capability at the BOP at all, certainly for that brief
     period of time.
 4
 5
           MS. TAYLOR: Right.
 6
            THE COURT: All right. So it's up to you, and I hope that
 7
     you're sincere in your beliefs in how you're going to live your
 8
     life moving forward and that you work really hard at appreciating
 9
     that we're one society, and it's not made up of individuals, it's
10
     make up of our collective country.
11
           And if you study our history, you'll realize that we for
12
     200 years have been a collection of people coming from all over
13
     the world, and that's what makes us the greatest country in the
14
     world. Open your eyes and see that, and if you do that, you're
15
     bright, you've got great support from your family, and good
16
     things will happen. So be vigilant and make it happen, all
17
     right, sir?
18
            THE DEFENDANT: All right, Your Honor.
19
            THE COURT: Okay. All right. Good luck to you.
20
     you, Ms. Taylor. Mr. Mariano, thank you.
21
            (Proceedings adjourned at 10:43 a.m.)
22
23
24
25
```

1			
2			
3			
4	СБРПТБТСАПБ		
5	<u>CERTIFICATE</u>		
6	I, Scott L. Wallace, RDR-CRR, certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.		
7			
8	/s/ Scott L. Wallace	4/21/20	
9	Scott L. Wallace, RDR, CRR	Date	
10	Official Court Reporter	2430	
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			